UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff

vs.

CIVIL NO. 18-03822

FILED

APR 8 2019

KATE BARKMAN, Clerk By_____Dep. Clerk

CHARLES J. SCHOEFER a/k/a CHARLES SCHOEFER a/k/a C.J. SCHOEFER

Defendant

MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER RULE 1200 FOR INSUFFICIENT SERVICE OF PROCESS

The defendant moves to dismiss the action because:

1. the defendant has not been properly served, as shown by the attached affidavit.

2. the defendant is personally within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

3. defendant lacks knowledge or information outsident to form a belief, about the truth of plaintiff's allegation that it attempted personal service at his domicillary address, 327 Winouae Street, Philadelphia, PA 19144-3924, of fifty-two Philadelphia, PA 19144-3924, of fifty-two (52) years by a private process server.

H. defendant lacks knowledge or information
sufficient to form a belief about what the
sufficient to form a belief about what the
process server advised the plaintiff and
process server advised the property. The
did or did not do at the property. The
property records would indicate to anyone
property records would indicate to anyone the property is owned by me since 1967.
There was ino answer, it was propably
because I was out or possibly a sleep, 5. défendant does not contest what Par. C.P. 4026 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (e) or Par. C.P. 430(a) provide vegarding original Process, but denies absolutely that he has concealed his whereabouts or otherwise obstructed service of process. 6. défendant lacks knowledge or information o verenant lacks knowledge or insormation to form a belief a bout what plaintiffed id there a good faith I lived there after to make a good faith I lived there after the neighbor "confirmed" that I lived him. The neighbor "confirmed" that I lived him. The neighbor "confirmed" that I lived him. The neighbor "so in and out all the there is nothing time" of where they live. There is nothing time of where they live about it, of where our netarious about it.

7. Plaintiff is correct and defendant admits that "There are no other afternate addresses for Defendant, but denies that, therefore Defendant Cannot be personally served within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania or anywhere. In fact in an unvelated legal matter, defendant is the appeal of a decision by the Board of Revision of Taxes to the Common Pleas Court of Division Philadelphia and is required to serve the Board, the City of Philadelphia Law Department, Tax Unit, and the Office of General Counsed of the School District of This ladelphia by Certified Mail/Retwu Receipt Requested. See Defendant Affidavit of Service in that Case, Defendant has Proof of Service in the Court of Common Pleas Case. The Plaintiff does not have it in the instant case.

WHEREFORE Defendant respectfully moves this Court to dismiss the care moves this Court to dismiss the care because the defendant has not been properly because the defendant by the attached served, as shown by the attached affidavits of defendant, affidavits of defendant.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles 5 hoster prose

Charles 5 hoster prose

32-1 Winona Street

Philadelphia, PA 19144

(213) 279-3947

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Plaintiff

CIVIL ACTION NO. 18-03822

CHARLES J. SCHOEFER

Defendant

AFFIDAVIT

vies Schoeter, prose, depose and the following is true and correct my Knowledge and is based

2. Plaintiff's investigation revealed no new address for the Defendant. That's because he doesn't have any. 3. Plaintiff's attempts to use a private process server from forth (4) to sixty (60) miles away in Berks Country was foolish and silly. Plain tist could have simply mailed the Summons and Complaint in Enforced Collections to the Complaint by vegistered mail/veturn Defendant by vegistered mail/veturn receipt veglested. The Plain tiff has had forty (40) years to do it. It is absolutely not imposible. 5. Plaintiff has made little to no effort to locate the Defendent for over footy (40) years and he can be easily found within the tastery District of Pennsylvania.

DEFENDANT AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE



IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA TRIAL DIVISION – CIVIL

No.

Appeal of

Appellant

MARCH 2019 Term, 2019

001036

From the decision of:
THE BOARD OF REVISON OF TAXES
OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

BRT NO. 124065100

STANDING ORDER MARKET VALUE ASSESSMENT APPEAL

TO THE APPELLANT:

- 1. Service: Appellant must serve a copy of the appeal papers and a copy of this Order on each of the following parties, except themselves, by certified mail/return receipt requested. These copies must be served within twenty (20) days of the date of this Order.
 - a. Property Owner (unless Appellant)

b. The Board of Revision of Taxes Curti-

Curtis Center, Suite 325 East

601 Walnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19106

c. The City of Philadelphia Law Department Tax Unit The Municipal Services Building 1401 JFK Boulevard, 5th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19102 (Attn: Anthony Barreca)

d. Office of General Counsel
The School District of Philadelphia

440 North Broad Street, 3rd Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19130

Note: Failure to serve the above appeal papers upon any of the above offices or parties may result in the dismissal of your appeal. Keep your return receipts. Appellant must present proofs of service by return receipts which are available from the Post Office.

In Re Appeal Of Schoefer Charles-CMOIS



Collect on Delivery
Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

Insured Mail Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

e Number (Transfer from service label)

3380 0000 9205 3307

n 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

☐ Signature Confirmation™
☐ Signature Confirmation

Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff

CIVIL ACTION NO 18-03822

vs.

CHARLES J. SCHOEFER

Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that, in this case, complete copies of all papers contained in the attached Motion to Dismiss Under Rule 126 FOR Insufficient Service of Process were served upon Plaintiff at the property address by regular mail on April 8, 2019 upon i

Respectfully submitted,

By Charles Schooler, prose

327 Winova Street

Philadelphia, PA 19144

(215) 279-3947



I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Respectfully submitted,

